DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 174 722 UD 019 651

AUTHOR	Loewen, James W., Ed.
TITLE	School and Residential Desegregation.
INSTITUTION	Catholic Univ. of America, Washington, D.C. Center for National Policy Review.
PUB DATE	79
NOTE	21p.; Not available in paper copy due to print quality of the original document
AVAILABLE FROM	Center for National Policy Review, Catholic University Law School, Washington, D.C. 20012 ($2.00)
JOURNAL CIT	Clearinghouse for Civil Rights Research; v7 n1 Spr 1979
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Change Strategies; *Community Benefits; Elementary Secondary Education; Government Role; Inner City; *Integration Effects; Minority Group Children; *Neighborhood Integration; Racial Integration; School Administration; *School Integration; *Social Change; Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

This paper presents two articles which deal with school desegregation. Ronald D. Henderson and Mary von Euler review research on the topic and discuss the benefits of early desegregation, changes in the school that facilitate the process, long-term gains for minority youth in desegregated schools, and the role of faculty, staff, the courts, and the government in making desegregation more effective. James W. Loewen examines the relationship between school and residential integration and cites specific instances where school desegregation has helped to desegregate neighborhoods. (Author/EB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Clearinghouse for Civil Rights Research

A publication of the Center for National Policy Review

VOLUME VII # 1
SPRING, 1979

ED174722

SCHOOL AND RESIDENTIAL DESEGREGATION

Brown v. Board of Education made history a quarter century ago. One widely noted aspect of the case was a statement of prominent social scientists, "The Effects of Segregation and the Consequences of Desegregation," appended to appellants' brief. The statement, assessing the race status differential created by segregation, concluded that it was wrong:

> (1) because enforced segregation results from the decision of the majority group without the consent of the segregated and is commonly so perceived; and (2) because historically segregation patterns in the United States were developed on the assumption of the inferiority of the segregated.

These principles may well apply today to the segregation that locks black students into inner-city Northern Schools. We quote the Statement to indicate the continued relevance of social science observations to civil rights in general and to school and housing segregation in particular. The article by Henderson and von Euler in this issue makes such a contribution, by summarizing the newest research in a way that makes clear how desegregation can be accomplished and how its accomplishment can aid American race relations and minority opportunities.

2 WHAT RESEARCH AND EXPERIENCE TEACH US ABOUT DESEGREGATING LARGE NORTHERN CITIES, by Ronald D. Henderson and Mary von Euler. Any new publication by a social scientist who claims desegregation is unworkable receives headline media treatment. Meanwhile, a growing number of social scientists have studied desegregation plans and schools that work, as well as ones that don't, and have built up a storehouse of knowledge regarding how to do it right -- how to desegregate smoothly with real gains for minority and majority students. This article presents a "state of the science" bibliography, organizing research in a compact form that provides answers to policymakers in this area.

14 DESEGREGATING SCHOOLS CAN HELP DESEGREGATE NEIGHBORHOODS, by James W. Loewen. Impressionistic results indicate that school desegregation can help break down residential segregation. Since the American people overwhelmingly support the principle of desegregation while at the same time decrying busing, this finding may offer a way out of what otherwise seems to be a particularly intractable American dilemma.

17 DEPARTMENTS.
Contributors
Seeking Social Science
From the Director
Center Publications

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J Loewen
Cath House of America, Center for National Policy Review

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

UD019631

WHAT RESEARCH AND EXPERIENCE TEACH US ABOUT DESEGREGATING LARGE NORTHERN CITIES

by Ronald D. Henderson and Mary von Euler

A growing and impressive body of recent research demonstrates ways in which school desegregation has been made to work effectively and identifies factors important to future successes. This research, published at a time when controversy over desegregation has moved from the South to Northern cities, has received less public attention than the negative conclusions that some academics have drawn regarding resegregation in metropolitan areas. The new research addresses the same issues as the doom-sayers do, but from a different perspective, asking what has or has not worked, rather than assuming that the entire topic is unmanageable. Thus while some critics argue that desegregation in Northern cities is self-defeating because it leads to white flight (Coleman, 1978 a, b; Armor, 1978), this new research identifies conditions under which stability has been attained. While some scholars point to the fact that desegregation has not uniformly led to achievement gains (Armor, 1972), others have identified conditions under which desegregation is most likely to spur advances and has done so (Forehand, et al., 1976).

New insights have been provided partly by the use of appropriate methodologies, such as ethnographic studies (Cassell, 1978). Surveys, multiple regression analyses of quantifiable variables, and input-output research -- the traditional approaches of sociologists and economists -- tend to blur many critical variables in meaningless averages and treat desegregation as if it were a uniform treatment in all racially mixed schools. Ethnographers intensively examine a school or classroom over an extended time. Desegregation is a process, as is education itself. It may take six months or two years to understand, for instance, how teachers and students affect one another. Sociologists and social psychologists like Brookover (1978), Cohen (forthcoming), and Schofield (1978) combine observation with survey or quasi-experimental techniques that focus on variables that seem critical to the quality of classrooms. Using a mix of methods, they are able to avoid the handicaps afflicting surveys and other single-method quantitative approaches while not succumbing to the particular susceptibility to observer bias characteristic of many ethnographies. Thus they integrate the quantitative approach, that describes what variables correlate, with the ethnographic approach, that attempts to establish why.

At the same time, planners, researchers, and judges are learning now to take a broader view of the meaning of "racially identifiable schools." Dismantling a dual school system involves changing power structures and attitudes within schools (Cohen, forthcoming). And it takes more than the movement of pupils to "restore the victims of discriminatory conduct to the position they would have occupied in the absence of such conduct." Bradley v. Milliken (418 U.S. 717, 746 (1974)). Although lower courts in the South frequently required more than moving pupils (sometimes mandating remedial education, desegregation of teachers, and in-service training), not until Bradley v. Milliken II (433 U.S. 267 (1977)) did the Supreme Court rule that a broad array of components related to educational quality was essential to redress the wrongs of a segregated education system. District court decisions in Wilmington (Evans v. Buchanan, 446 F. Supp. 982 (D. Del. 1978)) and Cleveland (Reed v. Rhodes, 455 F. Supp. 1220 (N.D. Ohio 1978)) follow the same pattern. The components recommended by the courts are well grounded in research findings and respond to the need for basic reform of urban schools.

This paper will summarize the answers recent research and experience provide to the questions that policy-makers, planners, and educators are asking about what works in urban school desegregation.

ARE THERE PARTICULAR RATIOS FOR ASSIGNING STUDENTS THAT PROMOTE LEARNING AND RACIAL HARMONY?

Research results conflict on what the optimal ratios are between different racial and ethnic groups. This is an area for an entire paper and for further study, although most researchers agree that too few students of any group promotes sterotyping and isolationism (Willie, 1976; Pettigrew, 1978; Crain, 1978). It also seems clear that social classes, as well as races, must be mixed. Studies of "school climate" demonstrate that high student achievement as well as good race relations are greatly furthered by having some students from high socioeconomic groups. Their presence helps to create a positive climate in which teachers and students believe they can succeed, and in fact succeed. Effective schools can be heavily minority, if the proportions are stable, so long as some of the students are of the high status group (Davidson, et al., 1978). Schools populated overwhelmingly with poor children are typically pervaded with a sense of defeat and have low student achievement (Levine and Havighurst, 1977; Levine and Meyer, 1977). The system tends to write off these schools as a hopeless cause (Hawley and Rist, 1975; Pettigrew, 1971; Bell, 1978).

It has been variously suggested by researchers that for effective community participation and healthy interpersonal relations, no group should ordinarily be smaller than twenty or thirty percent of the school (Willie, 1976; Pettigrew, 1978; Epps, 1975).

WHAT ASSIGNMENT POLICIES PROMOTE STABLE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS?

We now know several ways to promote stable school desegregation. Metropolitan plans seem least prone to "white flight." Researchers such as Orfield (1978a), Coleman (1978a,b), Armor (1978), and Rossell (1978), as well as planners like Foster (1973), agree that accessible suburbs impede the stable desegregation of cities that are more than 35 percent minority, whereas metropolitan area plans work. Since the Supreme Court in Milliken v. Bradley (418 U.S. 717 (1974)) limited court-ordered metropolitan plans to situations in which there was an inter-district violation, courts have thus far ordered few metropolitan plans, except where the district itself is metropolitan in character. Otherwise, the readily available means are voluntary transfers, inter-district school board action, and state legislation or administrative requirement. Metropolitan desegregation probably encourages people to live in integrated neighborhoods from which student transfers will be unnecessary, a hypothesis now being tested by Pearce and Orfield in a study of paired metropolitan areas. A component of such plans that enhances residential stability and augments the value of integrated neighborhoods is to exempt from busing students living in integrated neighborhoods and students in the minority in their neighborhood schools. This policy is part of the desegregation plans in Louisville/Jefferson County, Las Vegas/Clark County, and Omaha. In Louisville, integrative effects have been noted (Finger, 1976; Kentucky Human Rights Commission, 1977; Rossell, 1978). In Los Angeles, which began implementing a partial plan in September, 1978, real estate ads are already appearing for "excellent integrated schools" (Pettigrew, 1978:73).

To foster racial and social class integration, as part of a comprehensive city-only plan, incentives or aid can be provided for voluntary interdistrict transfers. It is doubtful whether providing money for transfers changes people's minds. However, the aid enables the programs to exist for willing participants (NIE, 1977, 136-138).

Willie and Greenblatt (in progress) point out that seven percent of Boston's public school children voluntarily enroll in an interdistrict transfer program. They note that

for voluntary programs to work, there must be ways for parents to influence the education of their children in the schools to which they transfer. It is not enough to assume that a minority child should consider himself fortunate to be in a "good" suburban school, if that school is unprepared for him. They conclude that ten percent participation is a feasible goal for voluntary programs that are backed up by city-only mandatory desegregation plans. At the same time, suburban and other white children benefit from the desegregated experience. Wynne (1977) has observed that segregated schools are otherwise unhealthy social environments for white children, imparting a smug sense of superiority (see also U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1977).

Careful consideration also must be given to racial and ethnic group assignment patterns that discourage white flight. One useful model calls for white Anglos to be assigned to Hispanic neighborhood schools, blacks to white neighborhood schools, with schools in black neighborhoods enriched as magnet schools (Rossell, 1978; Farley, 1978). Farley's analysis of behavior in Los Angeles confirms Rossell's conclusions from the study of 115 other cities that whites are less likely to flee predominantly Hispanic schools than predominantly black schools. However, assignment policies must be carefully assessed from the standpoint of fairness and perceptions of fairness. For example, plans that require only black children to be transported are viewed by black parents as inequitable. Crain (1978) and Pettigrew (1978) provide persuasive evidence for the educational value as well as the likely stability of tri-ethnic schools that are not composed overwhelmingly of any one racial or ethnic group. Rossell (1978) has also concluded that plans are more stable if they are implemented all at once, for an entire city and at all grade levels. Piecemeal and phased-in plans cause the most white flight. To concentrate desegregation on borders of ghettos or in areas that are in racial transition only accelerates white flight (Orfield, 1978b). Moreover, desegregation plans that affect only part of the community are not perceived as fair. These particular conclusions are difficult to apply in a predominantly minority city, especially if its suburbs refuse to participate. Nonetheless, for best long run results, school ratios should tend to be uniform throughout the metropolitan area (Pettigrew, 1978). Bussing as a desegregation tool has obvious positive characteristics, though it is much maligned, for it makes possible most of the above outcomes.

IS IT MORE IMPORTANT TO DESEGREGATE CHILDREN OF CERTAIN AGES?

Researchers have found that favorable effects of desegregation are enhanced when desegregation begins early -- in first grade or earlier. As Pettigrew (1975), St. John (1972), and others have pointed out, the very young accept desegregation, because their minds have not yet been formed about racial differences. Moreover, improvements in achievement of basic skills and in racial attitudes are cumulative. Models have been developed for successful voluntary integrated nursery schools in Nashville, Cambridge, Portland, Harrisburg, and New York City.

After analyzing the relationship of desegregation and student achievement, Crain and Mahard (1978) concluded that children in grades 4 to 8 may be particularly poorly fitted for disruption in their school experience. Junior high schools seem to have the most unsolved behavior problems, so they are the least likely candidates in which to begin (NIE, 1978).

Pettigrew (1978) points out that the desegregation of high schools is a critical element in establishing networks of opportunities for future jobs for minority youth. Senior high schools are somewhat difficult places to begin because previous schooling has made for wide differences in achievement that can lead to extensive "ability" grouping that

will be resegregative. Moreover, some hostile attitudes are already set and can lead to tense intergroup relations. When these tensions are coupled with the self-consciousness and peer pressures of adolescence, the odds against success are tipped further (NIE, forthcoming). However, high-school desegregation is doable, if approached intelligently. High-school students are old enough that they can respond to well-reasoned explicit ideological arguments for integration. And if attendance zones for desegregated schools are drawn thoughtfully, peer relations formed in the elementary years can be maintained in later schooling (Pettigrew, 1978); this also facilitates continuity of academic program, promotes parental involvement, and decreases student alienation.

Desegregation plans that involve all years at once probably give rise to less conflict than grade-a-year or other gradual or partial plans (Rossell, 1978).

WHAT CHANGES MUST TAKE PLACE WITHIN SCHOOLS TO PROMOTE GENUINE INTEGRATION AND REDUCE CONFLICT?

Researchers have found that cultural fairness should pervade the entire school structure and instructional activities. On the eve of Brown v. Board of Education, Allport (1954) defined a crucial fomenter of integration: for individuals of different races to have prolonged contact as equals in pursuit of common goals. When schools treat different cultures fairly and equally (not just through special "weeks" and the celebration of an occasional minority person's birthday), they contribute to student contact as equals (Rist, 1978). Desegregation is the ending of segregation. Integration involves cross-racial acceptance, equal access to high status academic and social positions in schools (Pettigrew, 1975; Schofield, 1978), and inclusion of elements of minority as well as majority subcultures in curriculum and activities. Banks (1978), Cortes (1978), and Gay (1978) have shown the contribution of a multi-ethnic curriculum to a climate of mutual respect and to minority pupils' sense of identity and self-worth. Arias (1978) describes alternative concepts of bicultural curricula and explains how they affect relations between Anglos and minorities in segregated and desegregated settings.

Desegregated schools with segregated classrooms cannot develop into integrated institutions and are seedbeds for conflict. Scholars have also noted the harmful effect of rigid ability grouping and tracking upon achievement by poor and minority children (Pettigrew, 1975, 1978). Teachers tend to classify children by social class, relegating the poor and minorities to lower tracks, stigmatizing them (Jones, et al., 1972; Crain, 1973) and expecting very little of them, even praising poor work from a condescending sense of kindness (Eddy, 1976; Mackler, 1969; Rist, 1970; Davey, 1973; Brookover, et al., 1978). What children learn depends to a large degree on what children expect of themselves and what their teachers and parents expect of them (Brookover, et al., 1978). Children, fully aware that they have been labeled (no matter what subterfuges schools employ), tend to fulfill the prophecy (Rist, 1970). Thus "desegregation" of a school system that resegregates its classrooms is not really desegregation at all. It leads to schools that in effect function as dual educational systems (NIE, forthcoming).

Researchers have looked at other aspects of equal treatment in physically desegregated schools, such as a nondiscriminatory testing program. Testing can be used fairly and effectively for purposes of diagnosing children's educational needs and prescribing programs to meet them, for measuring achievement, for keeping schools on target, but not for stigmatizing, sorting, and channeling children (CNPR, 1978).

Nonacademic factors, like conduct codes, school symbols, and activities, play a key role in successful desegregation -- and probably in successful public education generally. Studies have shown that desegregated schools, like all schools, need a uniform multicultural

code of conduct, firm discipline, and fair procedures and practices that are perceived as fair by all racial groups (Pettigrew, 1975; Mizell, 1978; Lincoln, 1976; NIE 1978 and forthcoming; Willie and Greenblatt, work in progress). Pettigrew (1975) and ethnographic researchers (NIE, forthcoming) have pointed to the importance of fair and desegregated participation in co-curricular activities, from sports and cheerleading to field trips. They have shown that school symbols, such as colors and mascots, can signal that a school belongs to only one group, or they can be integrated to foster a sense of ownership by all groups. Equal participation by all students frequently requires special consideration of the needs of children who are bused. Successful programs have been developed in Boston for pairing schools with artistic and educational institutions to enrich the school program and to provide integrated experiences (Willie, 1976; Scott, 1977; Anrig, 1978). Researchers have also observed that small schools and small classes tend to have less alienation and therefore less violence (NIE, 1978).

HOW CAN DESEGREGATED SCHOOLS CONTRIBUTE TO LONG-TERM GAINS FOR MINORITY YOUTH?

We have long known that often it's not what you know but whom you know that counts (Jencks, 1972); channeling and networking processes are at work in upward mobility. Pettigrew (1978) and Gottfredson (1978) have pointed out that minority youth have been excluded from the channels that lead to good jobs, and that desegregation may be opening those channels. Armor (1972) has noted that black students in desegregated schools tend to gain admission to better colleges.

In order for minority students to avail themselves of post-secondary education and to gain access to job networks, they need good counseling in desegregated schools (McPartland and Crain, 1978). Cole has demonstrated that counselors are critical to a desegregated education, if it is to lead to higher education, higher status occupations, and higher incomes. Counselors can be selected and trained to be fair, not to steer low socioeconomic status and minority youth into low-status vocational programs and high SES and white youth into colleges and high-status vocations with good employment prospects (Cole, 1978; Rosenbaum, 1976). It is also important that counselors not serve simultaneously as school disciplinarians.

HOW CAN FACULTY AND OTHER STAFF CONTRIBUTE TO SUCCESSFUL DESEGREGATED SCHOOLS?

Schools reforms cannot be carried out without leadership. Researchers have repeatedly noted that a strong principal with particular leadership characteristics is the key to a successfully desegregated school -- or to any good school. The principal sets the tone for a school and makes it clear to students and teachers what is expected of them (Egerton, 1977; NIE, 1978; Noblit, forthcoming).

Willie and Greenblatt (work in progress) conclude that faculty and staff at all levels must be desegregated to provide a basis for trust on the part of the minority community and to provide role models for children. Cohen (forthcoming) and Schofield (1978) have contributed substantially to our basic understanding of behavior in integrated classrooms. Cohen points out that minority children need to have role models among people with power in the school system. She notes the depressing effect on minority students' achievement when the members of their group serve only in powerless positions in the school, such as aides and cafeteria workers.

Gay (1978), Forehand, et al. (1976), Lincoln (1976), and Orfield (1975) have all explained the importance of effective in-service training for teachers, administrators,

school boards, and all supporting staff. The researchers observe that teachers need to learn how to teach children who may have been subjected to an inferior education, to teach heterogeneous groups of children, and to carry out most of the educational and institutional changes that successful desegregation requires. Lincoln notes that nonteaching staff also need training. For example, cafeteria workers can have an impact on the climate of race relations in a school, and custodians have been helpful in preventing and coping with conflict.

Gay (1978) has outlined the different kinds of training that teachers need:

--self-analysis to avoid stereotyping and other kinds of discriminatory behavior of which most people are unaware (What people do -- whether or not intentionally -- often matters more than what they say.);

--substantive knowledge of different groups' history, attitudes, behavior, and learning styles;

--techniques for teaching heterogeneous classes;

--techniques for solving daily problems, to avoid crises, and to relieve apprehensions (cf. Pettigrew, 1975).

Basic and applied researchers have made significant progress in learning how teachers can achieve Allport's goal of equal status conditions within classrooms. Specially-trained teachers have successfully created these conditions through such techniques as interracial cooperative teams, with favorable effects on both achievement and race relations (Johnson, 1975; Slavin, 1977; Cohen, forthcoming). Researchers have also begun to understand how to create a total school climate that is favorable to achievement and to healthy attitudes among students of high and low social status. Brookover, et al.(1978), have observed that poor and minority students perform well in school when the staff holds them to high standards for behavior and achievement. Eubanks and Levine (1977) have described successful programs in which teachers, students and parents make the same kind of commitment of time, attitudes, and expectations regarding the achievement of lower class and minority students that are routinely made to affluent white students.

HOW CAN COURTS AND ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES MORE EFFECTIVELY IMPLEMENT DESEGREGATION?

Schools are social institutions that reflect the values and tensions of a society. Because of the salience of race in America, desegregation -- probably more than any other school reform -- can be understood only in its social context. It is both cause and effect of social change. Willie (1978) shows how the effective achievement of desegregation requires increasing the power of minority groups, which ordinarily cannot be achieved without a boost from the courts. To bring about a lasting shift in the power structure of a community, judicial and administrative action would seem to require enforcement by means of a monitoring mechanism that provides minority groups in the community with information and influence.

Willie and Greenblatt (in progress) conclude from their study of ten districts of varying sizes and regions that a monitoring commission with clout is essential. It cannot be so large and representative as to be unwieldy nor so small as to lack a broad political base. The commission needs money, adequate staff, data supplied by the school district, and training to know what to look for (Finger, 1976; Carol, 1977; U. S. Department of Justice, 1977; Dentler, 1977).

CAN DESEGREGATION BE COUPLED WITH MORE EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND EQUITABLE ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES?

Desegregation involves costs, typically, but can also lead to savings (Pettigrew, 1978). For example, desegregation can result in more efficient and equitable use of classrooms, where some classes had been kept too large and others too small for purposes of maintaining segregation or where neighborhood assignment prevented the flexibility that bussing, magnet schools, or rezoning can provide. Voluntary transfer plans provide choices but make for inefficient and expensive transportation; greater transportation efficiency is possible when cities cooperate with suburban districts that usually have fleets of buses. Tompkins (work in progress) is examining options for more efficient use of resources while implementing desegregation in Ohio metropolitan areas.

For some time research on school resources seemed to lead to the conclusion that expenditures have little effect on outcomes for students (see Jencks, 1972; San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriguez, 411 U.S. 1. (1973)). A recent and thorough examination of the research (Porwoll, 1978) concludes that, when the data are analyzed for differences in age of children, subjects taught, methods used, and the nature of the students, small classes make a great deal of difference for low academic ability students and for low income children. This is not an argument for segregating poor and low-achievement students; in fact, all students were found to benefit from heterogeneous classes. However, it indicates that small classes are important to successful desegregation of central cities where there are concentrations of poor families.

IN WHAT WAYS CAN STATE AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENTS ASSIST DESEGREGATING SCHOOL DISTRICTS?

School districts that are desegregating need help from professionals with practical experience. At a recent Office of Education meeting, superintendents from districts that are desegregated said they could have used help from people who had been through successful desegregation at the local level, not from theoreticians and bureaucrats. People in many districts of varying size and racial composition are available with this expertise.

Mogin (1977) points out that only a few states have thus far acted firmly to promote desegregation. Most effective have been Illinois, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and New York, which have successfully brought about the desegregation of most moderate-sized communities. Particularly in those states, cooperation between Federal and State governments can increase the effectiveness of desegregation planning.

Willie and Greenblatt (in progress) express doubts, however, that states can be relied upon for enforcement, since state governments are too subject to negative political pressures. They describe the critical role of school-community relations to peaceful desegregation. Broad citizen and parental participation, necessary before a plan is promulgated, only develops when someone takes the lead. In Milwaukee that leadership came from the superintendent of schools; in Dallas it came from the business community; and in Omaha it came from a broad group of concerned citizens. After the plan is implemented, a citizen network, including rumor control, is necessary to the flow of accurate information to and from parents. In Boston and Erie, desegregation was found to have helped parents who were originally opposed to desegregation to have a stronger voice in their children's schools, leading to a healthier educational environment. Dentler (1977) emphasizes the necessity for attention to such details as location of meetings, transportation, personal invitations, and special language needs, to involve parents in the school to which children are transfered. Tompkins (1978) and Willie and Greenblatt (in progress) have described

effective community participation by businesses, churches, nonpublic schools, and local government that makes a plan responsive and gives different groups a sense of ownership in the plan as a whole. Researchers have examined the special problems of alienation that occur when certain schools are regarded as the turf of one ethnic group. Sensitive planning is required to broaden the sense of ownership and power to include the entire new community (Allport, 1954; NCQIE, 1977; NIE, forthcoming).

Another way government agencies can assist desegregation is by coordinating rather than cancelling out each other's efforts. Federal and local agencies can particularly try to coordinate school and residential policies. Public opinion polls indicate people prefer integrated housing to busing (Taylor, et al., 1978; Farley, et al.,1979;Farley,et al.,forthcoming). Moreover, segregated schools tend to cause segregating housing, just as segregated residential patterns promote segregated schools (Taeuber, 1977, 1979). Federal policies for transportation, urban renewal, revenue sharing, employment, and education have all contributed to concentrating minorities in central cities and whites in suburbs. These policies can be reversed, and most effectively if they are reversed simultaneously and consistently, so efforts reinforce rather than cancel each other. Bullock (1976), Orfield, (1978b), Taylor (1978), and Crain (1978:77-88) have sketched preliminary plans for coordinated desegregation of schools and housing.

CONCLUSION

Recent research makes clear that successful desegregation has occurred and can be replicated. While reports in the press give the impression that desegregation research is mostly engaged in quibbling about "white flight" and mostly inconclusive (Savage, 1979), the apparent standoff between opposing camps of experts is misleading. Regarding achievement, for example, there are studies indicating a positive effect on minority achievement and studies indicating a negative effect (See Weinberg, 1975; St. John, 1975, 1977; Bradley, 1977; and Crain and Mahard, 1978, for summaries of more than 200 studies analyzing desegregation and achievement.). Such studies may not even be in conflict, for both may confirm that desegregation as a process requires certain conditions for a successful outcome for minority students. In this instance, then, the question should be, "What educational practices and societal processes lead to a negative outcome, when we know that positive outcomes have also been obtained?"

In short, questions can be improperly posed. "Does desegregation improve minority achievement?", for example, posed with the implication that if it does not, then desegregation as a policy should be abandoned, is not an appropriate question. Rather, it should be noted that desegregation is a legal and moral imperative for American society, if we are to obey our Constitution and improve long-term opportunities for minorities. When researchers ask useful questions -- what works under what conditions -- and adopt methodologies that are appropriate to their purpose -- not obscuring distinctions between creative and destructive practices by assuming desegregation is an identical process whenever it occurs -- policy-makers can find some helpful answers.

REFERENCES.

Allport, G. (1954) The Nature of Prejudice. Reading, Mass: Addison Wesley.

Anrig, G. (1978) "State Leadership in School Desegregation." Denver: National Project and Task Force on Desegregation Strategies, Progress, fall.

Arias, B. (1978) "A Report to the Honorable Judge Paul Egly," Crawford v. Board of Education of the City of Los Angeles Case No. 822-854, Los Angeles County Superior Court, 11/6/78.

Armor, D. (1972) "The Evidence on Busing," The Public Interest, 28:90-126.

Armor, D. (1978) White Flight, Demographic Transition, and The Future of School Desegregation. Santa Monica: Rand.

Banks, J. (1978) Seattle: University of Washington, presentation at Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, March 4-8.

Bell, D. (1978) "The Mirage of Metropolitan School Remedies." Denver: National Project and Task Force on Desegregation Strategies, Legal Analysis No. 2.

Bradley, L., and Bradley, G. (1977) "The Academic Achievement of Black Students in Desegregated Schools," Review of Educational Research, 47: 399-449.

Brookover, W., et al. (1978) "Elementary School Social Climate and School Achievement," American Educational Research Journal, 15: 301-318.

Bullock, C., III (1976) "Desegregating Urban Areas: Is It Worth Doing? Can It Be Done?," School Review, 84: 431-448.

Carol, L. (1977) Court Mandated Citizen Participation in School Desegregation Monitoring Commissions. Cleveland: Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools.

Cassell, J. (1978) A Fieldwork Manual For Studying Desegregated Schools. Washington: National Institute of Education.

CNPR, (1978) "Testing and Citizenship," Washington: Center for National Policy Review, Clearinghouse for Civil Rights Research, 6.

Cohen, E. (forthcoming) "Design and Redesign of the Desegregated School." Palo Alto: Stanford University.

Cole, K. (1978) "Guidance and Counseling in the Desegregated School," Theory Into Practice, 2: 183-186.

Coleman, J. (1978a) "Beneficial Desegregation v. Destructive Desegregation," Washington Post, 12/8/78.

--- (1978b) "New Incentives for Desegregation," Human Rights, 7: 10-15, 48-49.

Cortes, C. (1978) Riverside: University of California, presentation at Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, March 4-8.

Crain, R. (1973) Southern Schools: An Evaluation of the Emergency School Assistance Program and of Desegregation, Vol. I. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center.

--- (1978) "Report to the Honorable Paul Egly on The Crawford Remedy," Crawford v. Board of Education City of Los Angeles, Case No. 822-854, Los Angeles County Superior Court, 11/14/78.

Crain, R. and Mahard R. (1978) "Desegregation and Black Achievement." Duke University: Institute of Policy Sciences and Public Affairs, National Review Panel on School Desegregation Research.

Davey, A. (1973) "Teachers, Race, and Intelligence," Race, 15: 195.

Davidson, J., et al. (1978) "Measuring and Explaining High School Interracial Climates," Social Problems, 26: 50-71

Dentler, R. (1977) "Educational Implications of Desegregation in Boston," 177-192 of Levine and Havighurst, eds., The Future of Big-City Schools. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Eddy, E. (1976) Walk the White Line. New York: Doubleday.

Egerton J. (1977) Education and Desegregation in Eight Schools. Evanston: Center for Equal Education (now in Amherst).

Epps, E. (1975) "Impact of School Desegregation on Aspirations, Self-Concepts and Other Aspects of Personality." Law and Contemporary Problems, 39: 300-313.

Eubanks, E. and Levine, D. (1977) "Jessie Jackson's PUSH Program for Excellence in Big-City Schools," 218-234 of Levine and Havighurst, eds., The Future of Big-City Schools. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Farley, R. (1978) "Report to the Honorable Paul Egly in Response to Minute Order No. 822-854," Crawford v. Board of Education of the city of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County Superior Court, 11/14/78.

--- et al. (1979) "Barriers to the Racial Integration of Neighborhoods," Annals, 441: 97-113.

--- et al. (forthcoming) "Chocolate City, Vanilla Suburbs," Social Science Research.

Finger, J., Jr. (1976) "Why Busing Plans Work," School Review, 84: 364-372.

Forehand, G., et al. (1976) Conditions and Processes of Effective School Desegregation. Princeton: Educational Testing Service.

Foster, G. (1973) "Desegregating Urban Schools," Harvard Educational Review, 43 (Feb.): 5-36.

Gay, G., (1978) "Multicultural Preparation and Teacher Effectiveness in Desegregated Schools," Theory Into Practice, 17: 149-156.

Gottfredson, L. (1978) "An Analytical Description of Employment According to Race, Sex, Prestige, and Holland Type of Work," Journal of Vocational Behavior, 13: 210-221.

Hawley, W. and Rist, R. (1975) "On The Future Implementation of School Desegregation," Law and Contemporary Problems, 39: 412-426.

Jencks, C., et al. (1972) Inequality. New York: Basic Books.

Johnson, D. and Johnson, R. (1975) Learning Together and Alone. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Jones, J., et al. (1972) "Increasing the Gap Between Whites and Blacks," Education and Urban Society, 4: 339-349.

Kentucky Human Rights Commission (1977) Housing Desegregation Increases as Schools Desegregate in Jefferson County. Louisville.

Levine, D. and Havighurst, R. (1977) "Desegregation Policy, Urban Development, and the Future Big-City Schools," 267-283 of Levine and Havighurst, eds., The Future of Big-City Schools. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Levine, D. and Meyer, J. (1977) "Desegregation and White Enrollment Decline in a Big-City School District," 55-69 of Levine and Havighurst, eds., The Future of Big-City Schools. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Lincoln, W. (1976) "Mediation: A Transferable Process for the Prevention and Resolution of Racial Conflict in Public Secondary Schools." Washington: National Institute of Education.

Mackler, B. (1969) "Grouping in the Ghetto," Education and Urban Society, 2: 82.

McPartland, J. and Crain, R. (1978) "Discrimination, Segregation, and Minority Social Mobility Processes," paper prepared for National Academy of Sciences.

Mizell, H. (1978) "Designing and Implementing Effective In-School Alternatives to Suspensions," Urban Review, 10: 213-336.

Mogin, B. (1977) The State Role in School Desegregation. Stanford: Stanford Research Institute Research Note 23.

NCQIE (1977) The Role of the Community in the School Desegregation Process. Washington, National Center for Quality Integrated Education.

NIE (1977) School Desegregation in Metropolitan Areas: Choices and Prospects. Washington: National Institute of Education.

--- (1978) Violent Schools-Safe Schools, Volume I.

--- (forthcoming) Ethnographic Field Study in Urban Desegregated Schools.

Noblit, G. (forthcoming) "Patience and Prudence in a Southern High School," in Rist, R., ed., Desegregated Schools. New York: Academic Press.

Orfield, G. (1975) "How to Make Desegregation Work," Law and Contemporary Problems, 39: 314-340.

--- (1978a) Must We Bus? Washington: Brookings.

--- (1978b) "Federal Agencies and Urban Segregation," paper prepared for the Ford Foundation.

Pearce, D. and Orfield, G. (in progress) "The Impact of School Desegregation on School Reputation and Housing Choices," a study under an NIE grant.

Pettigrew, T. (1975) "The Cold Structural Inducements to Integration." Urban Review, 8: 137-144.

--- (1978) "Report to the Honorable Judge Paul Egly in Response to the Minute Order of February 7, 1978," Crawford v. Board of Education of the City of Los Angeles, Case No. 822-845, Los Angeles County Superior Court, 11/14/78.

Porwoll, P. (1978) Class Size. Arlington: Educational Research Service.

Rist, R. (1970) "Student Social Class and Teacher Expectations," Harvard Educational Review, 40: 411-451.

--- (1978) The Invisible Children. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Rosenbaum, J. (1976) Making Inequality. New York: Wiley.

Rossell, C. (1978a)Assessing the Unintended Impacts of Public Policy. Washington: NIE.

--- (1978b)"School Desegregation and Community Social Change," Law and Contemporary Problems 42.

St. John, N. (1972) "Social Psychological Aspects of School Desegregation," 133-149 of Walberg and Kopan, eds., Rethinking Urban Education, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

--- (1975) School Desegregation. New York: Wiley.

--- (1977) "The Effects of School Desegregation on Children," paper prepared for American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Savage, D. (1979) Press Briefing on the 1980 Budget, Washington: National Institute of Education, January 23.

Schofield, J. (1978) "The Impact of Positively Structured Schooling on Intergroup Behavior," National Institute of Education.

Scott, M. (1977) "Pairings in Boston," 192-206 of Levine and Havighurst, eds., The Future of Big-City Schools. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Slavin, R. (1977) "Using Teams to Desegregate the Classroom," presented at Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Taeuber, K. (1977) "Demographic Perspectives on Metropolitan School Desegregation," 7-15 of School Desegregation in Metropolitan Areas. National Inst. of Educ.: Washington.

--- (1979) "Housing, Schools, and Incremental Segregative Effects," Annals, 441: 157-67.

Taylor, D., et al. (1978) "Attitudes Toward Racial Integration," Scientific American, 238: 42-49.

Taylor, W. (1978) "A Concerted Federal Approach to Segregation in Urban Housing and Public Schools," paper prepared for the Ford Foundation.

Tompkins, R. (1978) "Preparing Communities for School Desegregation," Theory Into Practice, 2: 107-114.

--- (in progress) "Information for Desegregation in Six Ohio Metropolitan Areas," Research under NIE grant.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1977) Statement on Metropolitan School Desegregation. Washington.

U.S. Department of Justice, Community Relations Service (1977) Viewpoints and Guidelines on Court Appointed Citizens Monitoring Commissions in School Desegregation. Washington.

Weinberg, M. (1975) "The Relationship Between School Desegregation and Academic Achievement," Law and Contemporary Problems, 39: 240-70.

Willie, C. (1976) "Racial Balance or Quality Education," School Review, 84: 313-325.

--- (1978) Sociology of Education. Lexington, Mass.:Lexington Books.

--- and Greenblatt, S. (in progress) "Comparative Community Analysis of Conflict Resolution in School Desegregation," A study under an NIE grant.

Wynne, E. (1977) Growing Up Suburban. Austin: University of Texas Press.

DESEGREGATING SCHOOLS CAN HELP DESEGREGATE NEIGHBORHOODS

by James W. Loewen

Status and segregation are tightly intertwined in American cities. In rural areas, a small farm or tenant house can coexist with a mansion or plantation. Everyone knows enough about everyone else to know who is rich and who is poor, and the social structure of patterned associations among school children mirrors the status inequality of their parents (cf. Coles, 1977). But in metropolitan areas, the symbols of status become more important, because each person has less information about others. Nor can parents be sure that their children will associate only with children of their friends. So those with social power express that power in part by affecting others: they exclude those whose racial or economic status is markedly lower than their own. Suburban developments with homes in narrow price ranges result, assuring that residents will associate only with persons of like status.

Within such a system, the family that remains in a neighborhood becoming significantly black or Hispanic or whose children attend a school becoming significantly black or significantly minority is asked, at least implicitly, "how come? Can't you do better?" Given the matrix of assumptions this residential pattern expresses, the parental obligation is to provide a "safe" environment, a "good" school, the "best" for the children, and a location expressing that the family does have the social power to live white. One moves to a "better" neighborhood or organizes to keep minorities out. Either action is segregative, by class as well as by race. Given these assumptions, it is easy to see why partial desegregation plans typically spur white withdrawal to areas where white children aren't bussed or paired, or engender resistance from white areas singled out for desegregation while other parts of the metropolitan area to get to stay white (Orfield, 1978, 143-150). For their part, black families hesitate to move to white areas distant from the black community, where their children will be a small minority of the school population, so their residential choices also keep the city segregated.

On both sides, there develops a we/they mentality. Bizarre preconceptions can build about those other parts of the metropolitan area where "they" live or which are integrated. And we move toward becoming two Americas, separate and suspicious. The problem appears intractable. It is hard to desegregate neighborhoods so long as white areas assure white schools, hard to desegregate schools so long as neighborhoods are segregated.

At the same time, whites in increasing proportions state that they favor desegregation of schools and neighborhoods. More than three fourths of Northern white parents say they would not object to sending their children to schools where half of the students were black

(AIPO, 1976, 9). Only 13% of whites nationwide would move if a black family moved next door, compared to 45% in 1963 (AIPO, 1978). What are we to make of these survey responses? Are they merely indicators of mass hypocrisy? Or do they indicate that both sides of the American dilemma described by Gunnar Myrdal long ago still exist -- the institutional discrimination and individual prejudice, on the one hand, and the good will and commitment to justice on the other? If so, perhaps school desegregation can tap this side of our national character. Then, just as segregated schools and segregated neighborhoods reinforce each other, so school desegregation perhaps can help cause residential desegregation, in turn leading to more school desegregation. A case study of one of America's most segregated cities indicates that this is a possibility.

In Jackson, Mississippi, prior to 1970, neighborhoods were overwhelmingly segregated. On a scale from 0 to 100 (Taeuber Index), with 0 indicating that all blocks have the same racial ratio while 100 indicates complete apartheid, larger American cities averaged 86.2 in 1960, while Jackson was still higher, at 94.2 (Taeuber and Taeuber, 1965, 32-7). 1970 statistics showed no significant change in either the nation (Sorensen, et al., 1975) or Jackson (Loewen, 1977). As in other cities, North and South, black areas were bounded by nonresidential areas (industry, railroads), by stable black/white boundaries, and by a slowly changing (transitional neighborhood) outer edge. Areas noncontinguous to the black community stayed all-white; blacks rarely ventured to seek housing there, and realtors avoided showing them any. Schools had been totally segregated by law; token freedom-of-choice desegregation had made no real dent in the dual school pattern.

School desegregation was implemented in January, 1970. Busing, pairing, and thorough faculty reassignment constituted a plan to make most schools have about the same racial ratio as the system. Recognizing that to abandon public education would condemn Jackson to years of economic stagnation, the white establishment urged support for the schools. As a result, although many affluent white parents put their children in private schools, middle- and lower-income whites felt able to stay with the public schools, and school desegregation became a reality.

Because schools are important social institutions, the change in them immediately affected other institutions and the general ideology. Now it was OK for whites and blacks to ride together in autos; they might be co-teachers at the same school. White clubs and restaurants, already open to black groups, now hosted interracial faculty parties and dinners, formal and informal. Institutions that served students -- from museums to McDonalds -- grew accustomed to serving blacks and whites together. Even close associations developed: within a year fourteen interracial couples existed at Provine High School alone.

The effect upon real estate was equally profound. Black families began buying in certain residential areas previously considered white. They knew they would no longer be lone intruders there, at least not in the schools. School desegregation also helped familiarize them with white neighborhoods they previously had considered geographically and socially distant. Most important of all, blacks felt empowered by school desegregation.

Conversely, whites felt less efficacious. Some whites still wanted all-white neighborhoods, but they no longer felt they could achieve them. There was a sense of inevitability about desegregation, a sense that the courts, the federal executive, even perhaps the spirit of the nation, were allied with blacks in opposition to racial barriers. "I don't like it, but what can we do?" was frequently voiced. Realtors still tried ruses to steer blacks away from white areas, but with less determination than before.

There were other reasons for the residential desegregation. In a sense, less was at stake. Since white neighborhoods no longer assured white schools, to desegregate neighborhoods no longer threatened white schools -- they were already desegregated. And their de-

segregation had not radically altered society -- life went on much as before. Thus whites felt less "racial patriotism."

Whites also had less of a status-derived interest in opposing black residents. No individual neighborhood and school could now go all-black while others stayed pridefully white. The distinction between a 75% black school and a 60% black school is marginal in terms of status differentiation, compared to the difference between a 60% black school and a 1% black school. Some whites now even saw reasons to favor interracial housing, for educators and wise parents knew that the only way to decrease busing and pairing for desegregation in the long run would be through the growth of residentially mixed areas.

More important than these direct interests, probably, was the general effect upon public rhetoric, probably the most sweeping single result of school desegregation in a community. When neighborhoods and schools are segregated and government condones it, the ideology of integration can be hard to voice, and actual integrative decisions by individual families can be even harder to make (See Stalvey, 1974, for a "grass-roots" description of this difficulty.). After a major institution desegregates, integrationism is easier to advocate. At neighborhood meetings to combat blockbusting, whites were able to say, some for the first time, that they thought desegregation was right. Those who proclaimed resistance were suddenly somehow on the defensive. Desegregation seemed to be an idea whose time was at hand.

With the breakdown of the ideology of resistance, we/they thinking also declined. Suddenly the fact that "their" children were two years behind in math mattered, because "they" weren't across town in "their" own schools, any more. Instead of pointing to the gap as a reason to avoid desegregation, now white parents realized that the children afflicted by it were with "our" children, whom they might be holding back. So there was a feeling that the schools needed to improve. Black students from nearby Tougaloo College, barred from practice teaching in Jackson since a library sit-in a decade before, were invited back, for educators realized their quality and their experience in dealing with whites as well as blacks might now be assets. Jackson had its first major curricular revision in 17 years in 1971. Individualized instruction, team teaching, and other innovations were tried, sometimes merely to be able to defend the system to white parents ("Johnnie doesn't have a black teacher, he has four teachers, and two of them are black", or "Suzy won't be held down by 'them;' her instruction is individualized."), but sometimes from a real concern for the educational needs of all members of a heterogeneous student body. And this decrease in racial polarization again helped decrease resistance to residential desegregation.

The 1980 Census will help tell whether the opening of new areas to black residents amounted merely to new sites for block-busting or whether stable interracial neighborhoods might result. Certainly even school desegregation itself is tenuous in a system where 70% of the students are black and there has been considerable white flight. A number of specific steps need to be taken to enhance the ways school and neighborhood desegregation can reinforce each other, in Jackson and elsewhere.

Some innovations are suggested by the Louisville (Ky.) desegregation experience. In Louisville and Jefferson County, families who live in neighborhoods where they are a small minority are exempted from busing. Black families who want neighborhood schools for their children have an added reason to move to white suburbs and have do so, often in areas distant from the black community. (Whites have not chosen to obtain this same relief from busing by moving to black neighborhoods.) Spurred by the Kentucky Commission on Human Relations, city/county school desegregation was accompanied by the merger of the city and county Section 8 housing offices. This action made suburban housing much more salient to black Louisville. The Commission produced a pamphlet, Six Ways to Avoid Bussing, which amounted to

six ways to achieve residential desegregation. And it undertook a campaign to familiarize black prospective homebuyers with white neighborhoods.

The program is working. "In just three years the number of black pupils residing outside the city of Louisville has increased more than in the entire twelve-year period [1961-73]" (KCHR, 1971, 1). And as the table indicates (modified from KCHR, 1971, 2), this increase "has not occurred in those suburban areas where blacks are already concentrated;" 86% of the new black suburbanites moved to areas where their children were exempted from busing because they lived in desegregated housing. White resistance to these moves was lessened by the fact that if a white neighborhood thus becomes as black as the district as a whole, the school can exempt it from busing altogether.

Table 1. Black Pupils' Residence in Segregated and Desegregated Areas of Suburban Jefferson County, 1974-77.

Location	1974	%	1977	%	Change, 1974-7	%
Segregated areas	2157	54	2506	39	349	14
Desegregated areas	1791	46	3945	61	2154	86
Totals	3948	100	6451	100	2503	100

Scattered results from other communities indicate that residential desegregation occasioned by school desegregation is not limited to Jackson and Louisville but has occurred or is occurring in Milwaukee (Taeuber, 1979, 166), Riverside (Green, 1974, 252), Denver (Braunscombe, 1977), and elsewhere (Rossell, 1978, 29); Orfield, 1977, 51). Typically this desegregation is stable, because it is often of areas not adjacent to the black or Hispanic community; when such areas become interracial they tend to stay that way, rather than becoming all-minority (Johnston, 1972, 263).

What is happening in these cities may not happen everywhere. Nor can we expect full residential desegregation from school desegregation, for recent research indicates that most "white flight," including the continuing suburban movement of whites from Jackson, is caused by reasons other than race (Blakeslee, 1979). Thus, just as school desegregation is not a pervasive cause of white suburbanization, it cannot be much more than an opening wedge for residential desegregation, a wedge affecting social structure and its accompanying ideology. Other policies to support residential desegregation must come from HUD, lending institutions, local and regional planners, and others whose decisions affect the location of jobs, amenities, and public and private housing (cf. Levinsohn and Wright, 1976). The recent restructuring of the Justice Department, combining housing and education, may indicate that federal policymakers are realizing the interrelations between the two. If so, perhaps housing policies will change so that minority and majority families with integrationist values can find it easier and more acceptable to put them into practice.

REFERENCES

AIPO (1976) Gallup Opinion Index. Princeton: American Institute of Public Opinion, February.

-- (1978) Gallup Opinion Index. Same, November.

Blakeslee, Jan (1979) 'White Flight' to the Suburbs." Madison: Institute for Research on Poverty Newsletter, 3 #2, 1-4.

Braunscombe (1977) "Times Are A Changing in Denver." Denver Post, 5/1/77.

Coles, Robert (1977) Privileged Ones. Boston: Little, Brown.

Green, Robert (1974) "Northern School Desegregation," chapter 10 of Gordon, ed., Uses of the Sociology of Education (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press).

Johnston, R. J. (1972) Urban Residential Patterns. NY: Praeger.

KCHR (1978) "Housing Desegregation Increases as Schools Desegregate in Jefferson County." Louisville: Kentucky Commission on Human Rights.

Levinsohn, F.H., and Wright, B. D. (1976) School Desegregation. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Loewen, James W. (1977) "Affidavit" in Kirksey v. Jackson, Civil Action #J77-0075(N), S.D. Miss., 3/30/77.

Orfield, Gary (1977) "If Wishes Were Houses Then Busing Could Stop," in School Desegregation in Metropolitan Areas. Washington: National Institute of Education.

Rossell, Christine (1978) "School Desegregation and Community Social Change." Law and Contemporary Problems, 42 (Spring).

Sorenson, et al. (1975) "Indexes of Racial Residential Segregation for 109 Cities in the United States." Sociological Focus, 8, 125-142.

Stalvey, Lois Mark (1974) Getting Ready. NY: Morrow.

Taeuber, Karl (1979) "Housing, Schools, and Incremental Segregative Effects." Annals, 441 (January), 157-167.

--- and Taeuber, Alma (1965) Negroes in Cities. Chicago: Aldine.

CONTRIBUTORS

Ronald D. Henderson heads desegregation studies at the National Institute of Education. He holds a Ph.D. in sociology, has taught at all levels of education, and is the author of articles on desegregation, school climate, and urban education. Mary von Euler has advanced degrees in education and law, has been a high-school teacher and a social science researcher, and is now an attorney in desegregation studies at NIE. She is author of A Citizen's Guide to School Desegregation Law.

James W. Loewen is editor of the CLEARINGHOUSE and Director of Research for the Center.

SEEKING SOCIAL SCIENCE

For future issues of the CLEARINGHOUSE we welcome succinct statements of social science research relevant to minority rights and problems. Future issues will treat housing and lending, the state of our cities, cultural pluralism, employment, and other topics.

FROM THE DIRECTOR

A quarter of a century after the initial decision, the struggle to make Brown v. Board of Education, a living reality continues. The future course of school desegregation in the urban North may well depend on results of two cases, Columbus and Dayton, now before the Supreme Court.

The school boards in these cases seek to narrowly limit any remedy, arguing that the effects of deliberately segregative practices can be neatly isolated from those arising from residential segregation caused by a variety of other factors. In a statement appended to the brief filed on behalf of black Columbus school children, 36 social scientists discuss the interlocking nature of school and housing segregation, setting out ways in which neighborhoods may be defined racially by segregative school practices. They also summarize experience with the desegregation process, noting that, contrary to conventional wisdom, systemwide plans usually involving busing frequently gain greater acceptance and prove more stable than partial remedies.

While the role of social science in legal proceedings remains controversial, the Columbus Statement provides a model of how social scientists can help courts understand the impact of unconstitutional practices and the probable effect of proposed remedies. Among its signers are Kenneth Clark, Robin Williams, M. Brewster Smith, and John Hope Franklin, all participants in the social science work in the original Brown cases.

Bill Taylor

PUBLICATIONS LIST

Periodical

Clearinghouse for Civil Rights Research (published quarterly), one-year subscription $8.00; two-year subscription $15.00

Clearinghouse, Winter, 1978 issue, "Testing and Citizenship", 40 pp, $2.00

Reports

Equity Under CETA: Issues and Problems Facing Minorities, Women and the Poor Under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, September, 1978, 82 pp, $2.50

State of Metropolitan School Desegregation, A Report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, February, 1977. Single copies free on request

State Agencies and Their Role in Federal Civil Rights Enforcement, January, 1977, 97 pp, $3.00

Trends in Black Segregation, 1970-74, January, 1977, UD-016767. *Trends in Hispanic School Segregation, 1970-74*, January, 1977, UD-016775. Available from ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, Virginia 22210

General Revenue Sharing: The Case for Reform, 1976, 32 pp, $2.00

Equal Opportunity Under General Revenue Sharing, 1975, 51 pp, $1.00

Civil Rights Under General Revenue Sharing, 1975, 51 pp, $1.00

Justice Delayed and Denied: HEW and Northern School Desegregation, 1974, 117 pp, $3.00

Equal Job Opportunity in Law Enforcement, 1973, 13 pp, $1.00

Shelter and Surplus Land, 1973. Single copies free on request

Handbook

Fair Mortgage Lending: A Handbook for Community Groups, July, 1978 (together with flyer for individual homebuyers). Single copies free on request

The CLEARINGHOUSE disseminates current research in areas of minority and civil rights concern to people involved in influencing or making public policy.

Authors are invited to submit papers summarizing findings with policy implications.

Send articles or inquiries to James W. Loewen. Address subscription inquiries to Vickey Shay. Rates: $8/yr. (4 issues); $15 for two years.

The Center for National Policy Review is a group of lawyers and social scientists engaged in research and legal action, on behalf of civil rights groups and in the interests of minorities. We monitor federal programs to help assure that legislative advances in civil rights are translated into policies that stem the tide of racial polarization.

We are:

William L. Taylor, Director
(Education and Title VI)

Roger S. Kuhn, Co-Director
(Credit Discrimination)

Glenda Sloane, Supervising Attorney
(Housing and Community Development)

Morton Sklar, Employment Project Director
(Federal grants, Employment)

James W. Loewen, Director of Research
(Desegregation, Cultural Pluralism)

Vickey Shay, Administrative Secretary
Mary Tipton, Administrative Secretary
Ruth Shinker, Secretary

Copyright, 1979, Center for National Policy Review. Reproduction permitted with prior notification.

Clearinghouse for Civil Rights Research

Center for National Policy Review
Catholic University School of Law
Washington, D. C. 20064
(202) 832-8525

Nonprofit Organization
U.S. Postage
Paid
Washington, D.C.
Permit No. 711

Dr. Edmund Gordon, Director
Desegregation Assistance
Center for Race
Teachers College,

Columbia University
Institute for Urban Minor.
Education
525 W 120th St.
New York, N. Y. 10027

Return postage guaranteed
Address correction requested

C